

radio.

Please add claims 34 and 35 as follows:

1 ~~31~~ (New) The system of claim 1, wherein the skill level of the at least one task is represented by a number of points based upon a difficulty assessment of the at least one task.

22 ~~30~~ (New) The method of claim 20, wherein the skill level of the at least one task is represented by a number of points based upon a difficulty assessment of the at least one task.--

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 were pending in the subject application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-6, 12-16, 18, 20, and 26-30. Applicant has also added new claims 34 and 35. Accordingly, claims 1-35 are presently under examination. Applicant maintains that no new matter is presented. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter this Amendment.

Drawings

Applicant submits herewith a Letter With Proposed Drawing Changes proposing to amend Figures 5, 7 and 8 to be consistent with the specification. The proposed drawing changes do not add new matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the proposed drawing changes. Upon approval of the proposed drawing changes and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance, Applicant will attend to submitting corrected formal drawings in accordance with present Office practices.

Objections to the Specification

In Section 4 of the October 15, 1998 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification indicating that the related application information should be updated and Table 1, which appears on page 14 of the specification, should be limited to a width of 5 inches. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification to update the related application information. Applicant has also amended the specification and figures to be consistent with each other. Further, Applicant has submitted a substitute page no. 14 including Table 1 having a width of less than 5 inches as Exhibit 1 in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.58 and 1.96 to replace previously submitted page 14. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim Objection

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action dated October 15, 1998, the Examiner objected to claim 18 as incorrectly being dependent on claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 18 to be dependent on claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 18.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In Section 7 of the October 15, 1998 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-11, 17-30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sisley et al. (Sisley '728) in view of Ehlers et al. (Ehlers '438).

In Section 8 of the October 15, 1998 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 12-16, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sisley et al. (Sisley '728) in view of Ehlers et al. (Ehlers '438), and further in view of

Pickett et al. (Pickett '278).

The present invention discloses a system and method for computer-aided technician dispatch and communication (Specification at p.1, lines 19-20). The present invention includes, for example, a communications system linking a plurality of subscribers, a team of technicians, a service representative, and a user (Specification at p.6, lines 18-26). The present invention also includes an input terminal for receiving information including service request information from the plurality of subscribers, work order information from the team of technicians, technician information from the team of technicians, and quota information for a task of a work order (Specification at p.6, lines 2-26; p. 7, lines 26-31).

The quota information includes, for example, a skill level associated with a task and an amount of time determined to complete the at least one task (Specification at p.9, lines 1-5, 18-22; p. 9, line 31 to p.10, line 1). The present invention utilizes the quota information to effectively assign a suitable technician to the work order and maximize and track the amount of work orders that each of the technicians handle on a periodic basis (e.g., daily). The present invention also includes a server coupled to the input terminal for processing the service request information and for generating a graphical representation of the service request information. The present invention further provides a display for receiving the graphical representation of the service request information and for presenting the graphical representation to a user (Specification at p.6, lines 2-17; p.8, 1-22).

Sisley '728 relates to a resource management system including techniques for the assignment and scheduling of resource requests among a group of resource providers (col. 1,

lines 9-12). More specifically, Sisley '728 purportedly describes a system and method for assigning and scheduling resource requests to resource providers using a modified "best-first" search technique. See Sisley '728 Abstract. For example, potential changes to an existing assignment set are evaluated to determine a better solution in response to changes in a dynamic resource environment. Id. The search technique for a better solution in Sisley '728 assumes that the existing assignment set is already optimized and limits the task to only evaluating the effects of the incremental change. The Sisley '728 system generates assignment and scheduling recommendations, representing modifications of the assignment set, in response to changes in the dynamic attributes of the technician and call sets (Id. at col. 5, lines 42-59).

Further, in Sisley '728, the technician set includes technician attributes such as particular machines that the respective technician is qualified to service, a primary service territory, and a technician calendar (col. 5, lines 60-67). The call set includes machine models to be repaired, location of the machine, time customer call received, time prior to which technician is to arrive, whether customer has been promised a predetermined service time, technician commitment, priority of call and call status (col. 6, lines 1-12).

Ehlers '438 relates to an energy management and building automation system including a local area network or home automation data bus. Loads are connected to the bus via control modules that may contain circuit breakers to disconnect the loads from the mains upon command or the occurrence of a power outage. See Ehlers '438 Abstract. The Ehlers '438 system may also include a first microcomputer preferably external to the customer premises. Program modules to be executed in the first

microcomputer to perform conditional on/off device operations may include checking the status of a device to determine whether the device should be activated or deactivated based on, for example, time allotment (col. 27, lines 57-67. col. 28, lines 29-49).

Pickett '278 relates to a system for integrated data delivery in 911 calls for service applications. Pickett '278 includes a method to provide the ability to capture and utilize decoded caller data, automatically integrate one or more computer databases using caller data as a search key and integrating and formatting the caller information as it is returned by the database search. See Pickett '278 Abstract The information may include the address of the caller, geopolitical jurisdiction information, and the ability to integrate this information and any additional information provided by the calltaker. Further, the integrated data may be automatically transmitted via a telephone line to a radio common carrier (Id. at col.2, lines 18-36).

With regard to Sections 7 and 8 of the October 15, 1998 Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that Sisley '728, Ehlers '438 and Pickett '278, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 20 of the present application.

For instance, amended independent claim 1 recites a computer-aided technician dispatch system including

- an input terminal for receiving information,
the information including

- service request information from the
plurality of subscribers,

- work order information from the team of
technicians,

- technician information from the team of

technicians, and

quota information of at least one task of a work order ...

wherein the quota information includes a skill level associated with the at least one task and an amount of time to complete the at least one task.

Similarly, amended independent claim 20 recites a method for computer-aided technician dispatch including the steps of:

receiving information, the information including

service request information from the plurality of subscribers

work order information from the team of technicians,

and quota information of at least one task of a work order ...

wherein the quota information includes a skill level associated with the at least one task and an amount of time to complete the at least one task.

Applicant notes that the Office Action expressly acknowledges that Sisley '728 fails to teach or suggest an input terminal receiving quota information, much less "quota information that includes a skill level associated with the at least one task and an amount of time determined to complete the at least one task," as recited in the amended independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest the claimed input terminal and receiving such quota information.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action improperly combines Sisley '728 with Ehlers '438 and thus

the rejection must be withdrawn. As described above, Sisley '728 relates to a resource management system including techniques for the assignment and scheduling of resource requests among a group of resource providers (Sisley '728 at col. 1, lines 9-12). On the other hand, Ehlers '438 relates to an energy management and building automation system including a local area network or home automation data bus and program modules to perform conditional on/off device operations that may include checking the status of a device to determine whether the device should be activated or deactivated based on, for example, time allotment. Applicant respectfully asserts that such program modules to determine whether a device should be activated or deactivated is in no way related to a system for computer-aided technician dispatch receiving quota information including a skill level associated with the at least one task and an amount of time determined to complete the at least one task, as recited in the present application.

Indeed, the Examiner's attempt at combining Sisley '728 and Ehlers '438 demonstrates the impropriety of the combination. For example, even if the program module of Ehlers '438 could somehow be combined with the Sisley '728 system, a combination for which Applicant finds no teaching, the resultant ability for program modules to determine whether a device should be activated or deactivated in no way teaches or suggests the method or apparatus for a computer-aided technician dispatch system receiving quota information, the quota information including a skill level associated with the at least one task and an amount of time determined to complete the at least one task recited in the present application. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sisley '728 nor Ehlers '438 provide motivation that they be combined. In any event, as discussed

above, even if Sisley '728 and Ehlers '438 were combined, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Further, the integrated data delivery system described in Pickett '278 does not cure the deficiencies of either Sisley '728 or Ehlers '438 stated above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn. As claims 2-19 and 21-35 depend from and therefore include the limitation of their respective independent claims, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 2-19 and 21-35 also are not taught or suggested by Sisley '728, Ehlers '438 and Pickett '278, either individually or in combination. Further, dependent claims 34 and 35 recite "the skill level of the at least one task is represented by a number of points based upon the difficulty of the at least one task" which is not taught or suggested by Sisley '728, Ehlers '438 and Pickett '278, either individually or in combination.

In view of the amendments to the specification, drawings, claims and the remarks hereinabove, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections set forth in the October 15, 1998 Office Action and earnestly solicit allowance of all the pending claims.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicant's undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan S. Caplan
(Reg. No. 38,094)
BAKER & MCKENZIE
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 751-5700

4/15/99